

Research Activity Panel Meeting Summary
Chris Harrold, Monterey Bay Aquarium, RAP Chair

JULY 2003 RAP MEETING

Host: UCSC, Center for Ocean Health
Friday, July 11, 2003 9am to 12pm

In Attendance:

Members:

Chris Harrold, MBA – RAP Chair
Andrew DeVogelaere, MBNMS- RAP Coordinator
Mary Yoklavich, NOAA/NMFS
Steve Moore, CSUMB
Mark Carr, UCSC
Leslie Rosenfeld, NPS
Kerstin Wasson, ESNERR
Geoff Wheat, NOAA/NURP
Caroline Pomeroy, UCSC
Ross Clark, CA Coastal Commission
Gary Sharp, CCORS

Guests:

6 guests

PRESENTATIONS

Mark Carr postponed his presentation on PISCO, to allow for more time for discussion of the JMPR Action Plans

Institutional Update: UCSC Long Marine Lab (Gary Griggs)

Presentation on IMS and research: The Institute budget is suffering, decreasing at a rate of 10% per year over the last two years. Marine researchers enhance the budget through overhead on grants. The IMS site has grown extensively since the 1970's and there is still much build-out to occur. The goal is to bring together science, education and policy; to bring together university, other state and federal programs together.

Gary also serves on the U.C. Marine Council, that has a web site to help locate scientists in different fields of interest (see <http://www.ucop.edu/RESEARCH/UCMARINE>)

IMS is involved in several ocean observing projects including: the Center for Integrated Marine Technologies (NOAA funded \$2mil 1st yr; another proposal has been submitted); CENCOOS (NOAA funded to support a regional coordinator for Central California) request for proposals for coordinator; and NCAHOOTs (Proposition 40 funds for a State effort to bring people together to observe water quality issues).

IMS is also involved with a new environmental toxicology program on campus; a marine mammal partnership with MBA (focus on otters); a USGS-move of 125 people to a new coastal geology building; and developing a new graduate program on coastal marine policy.

Upcoming Jmpr SAC meeting July 30- August 1

Chris Harrold gave background on the Joint Management Plan Process, in relation to Action Plans (see the Sanctuary web site <http://www.sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/jointplan> for more information).

Comments on individual action plans:

Submerged cables

- The action plan did not sufficiently identify environmental risks (crossing rocky substrate) and feasibility of cable inspection.
- Characterization of the seafloor habitats is key (in fact, characterization of all habitats is important and should be elevated in the plan through SIMoN)

Harbors and Dredging

- The scientific community should be notified if dredging occurs, as they have instruments in these areas.
- It is critical to do research to understand why the need for dredging has increased through time (find watershed management solutions to dredging issues).

Introduced Species

- Priority strategies, especially relevant to the Sanctuary program are: early detection and an effective response plans, as well as stopping new invasions is of the highest priority.
- Other priorities are focusing on mechanisms of introduction (non-ballast) and education.

Benthic Habitats

- The action plan focused on the effects of trawling on benthic habitats, the title of this plan should be changed to reflect this.
- As mentioned for the cable plan, habitat characterization should be a critical research goal in this plan.
- The plan should reflect that the Sanctuary should be a model of adaptive management in dealing with trawling; including testing management strategies with experiments.
- More social science is needed

Davidson Seamount

- Not a topic that reached consensus.
- Some felt that this was a low priority relative to other management issues already on the Sanctuary plate, that including this into a draft management plan analysis would be too expensive; science may be more interesting at some other seamounts.
- Some suggest that the Sanctuary should participate in an effort to develop a national initiative to protect seamounts.
- Others felt that there are great education, protection and research benefits to having the Davidson be part of the Sanctuary. That a national initiative would not likely be considered by anyone if Davidson was not part of the Sanctuary. Cost could be minimal with significant conservation benefits, instead of waiting until there is a problem or commercial interest at the site. There are administrative and logistic advantages of Davidson being next to the MBNMS.

Special Marine Protected Areas

- Action plan lacks a discussion of success of other MPAs.
- The Sanctuary is poised to do high intensity experiments and that sociological impacts should be researched and addressed.
- Continued monitoring in existing reserves should be a priority.

Ecosystem monitoring

- It was agreed that the visibility of SIMoN must be elevated in the action plan.
- The Sanctuary should be involved in coordinating and archiving data.

Operations and Administration

- There should be a clear indication of “turn-around time” on permits, and scientists should be informed by the Sanctuary about what other agencies will also require a permit for the proposed research.